RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

BULLETIN

VOL. 6 | 15 SEPTEMBER 1950 | No. 4

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUILDING

RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

Published Quarterly By The
RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
(INCORPORATED)

1616 EYE STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON 6, D. C.
TELEPHONE STerling 8755

PRESIDENT
Vice Admiral Harry G. Hamlet, USCG, 6410 Beechwood Drive, Chevy Chase 15, Md., OL. 5966

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
Major General Louis McCarty Little, USMC, 3010 "O" St., N. W., MI. 7239

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
Major General Walter C. Baker, USA, Kennedy Warren Apts., CO. 8869

THIRD VICE PRESIDENT
Lieut. Comdr. Charles W. Cairnes, USCG, Ontario Apts., CO. 6800

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEGAL COUNSEL
Captain Franz O. Willenbucher, USN, 7103 Overhill Road, Bethesda, Md., WI. 5730

SECRETARY-TREASURER, Lieut. (jg) D. D. Davis, USNR

EDITOR .....Lt. Comdr. George M. Bailey, USCG

Entered as second class matter, May 2, 1945, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription price, 50c per year

STRENGTH SUPPLIED TO DESPERATE NEED

Many stories of strange and unusual experiences came out of the last war. One of those deemed to illustrate the type concerns a young paratrooper who, while dangling by his left foot from a parachute after bailing out of a transport plane during a swirling snowstorm, made his plea for help through prayer. It was his first "full dress" jump.

Realizing his plight to be beyond available human aid, his thought in that split second turned to God.

Before taking off, he had read the 145th Psalm. Now, in his distress, he was reciting its verses, "The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raiseth up those that are bowed down. The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him; to all that call upon Him in truth."

There was no mistaking the fact that he was in a spot. However, he did more than just pray. He made a frantic effort to extricate himself from his tragic predicament; meanwhile asking for strength to climb back into his parachute harness which had failed to fasten securely.

Gasping for breath in the icy air, and summoning his last ounce of energy, he was finally able to double his body and catch hold of the harness above his foot. Slowly (or so it seemed) he obtained a sitting position while dropping swiftly through the air.

In due course, he landed with a jolt, unbuckled his parachute, and gave Thanks!

A look backward through history will reveal a record of numerous instances of failure on the part of men, because of non-adherence to the principles of Faith.

Of such, General Pershing in World War I, stated: "I have practiced Faith now for forty-seven years, and could not face life without it. I pity those who are trying to live without its sustaining power. I heartily commend its use to you all."

Our only hope of salvation from a quagmire of unsolved problems in an uncertain and uneasy world today appears to lie within a strong, united America, seeking prayerfully for a just and honorable way to overcome the terrible menace of our present situation and the return of peace to all nations.

"NO" TO BE TAKEN ONLY AS A STARTER

***"I will find a way or make one."*—Hannibal**

Never let negative reaction deter you from carrying out a sound and constructive program is the wise and timely counsel of James T. Mangan, who says: "In business—as well as in all other pursuits of life—the closed door, the blockade, the 'NO' is the normal thing! Expecting to get what you are seeking the first time is a baby's idea. An experienced man knows it just doesn't happen that way. If your personal feelings of encouragement on the one hand, and depression on the other, are based on whether or not you are searching for pushovers, you are going to be depressed most of the time! Realize that 'NO' is the common, ordinary answer. When you get that 'NO' your work *begins!* Find a way around it, over it, or under it, and if your search reveals no way, then go out and make a new way."

Perhaps none know better than those of us engaged in a type of work—dealing with human factors having a direct bearing upon the security, comfort and contentment of retired personnel and their dependents—such as that to which this Association is dedicated, how vitally important it is *not* to regard an initial "NO" as a final and conclusive rejection; rather shall it be used as a point from which to commence a new intensive drive.

Few projects contained within the Association's program, designed to promote the lot of retired personnel and their dependents, have been blessed with initial success. But they are things we beileve to be just, right and deserving. Consequently, they are kept active by never passing up an opportunity to place a word of their need and simply justice before those whom we strive ultimately to convince of their true merit and worthiness.

All too often some are prone to first say "NO," if for no other reason than to require those who seek change to improve to justify their point by satisfying argument of proof. That, of course, is a delaying action, because it frequently happens that opportunity does not permit of lengthy detailed explanations at the particular moment. We then strive to establish further opportunity for discussion; meanwhile strengthening our argument in those cases where a seemingly plausible reason is stated to support an initial "NO," so as to refute any hastily arrived at or erroneous conclusions.

Not in the sense of excuse, but in all fairness, it must be stated that those officials of the Congress and of the Executive Departments who have authority over questions of utmost concern to the Association in behalf of its membership, are men laboring under tremendous and complex reponsibilities. The hours of the day are insufficient to permit them to follow closely any prearranged schedule. Our contact with them on our problems must, therefore, be accurately timed and tactfully limited to the allotted period of hearing.

Under such circumstances, it is but folly to expect too much, too easily, too soon. Suffice it to say, however, that our Association refuses to submit to any depression of spirit or courage when adverse conditions arise in our efforts to lend collective representation of the official affairs of retired officers, their dependents and survivors. The Association's alert and qualified staff works with restless determination to get across the necessity for maintaining good morale among retired personnel—not only as regards their own personal security—but as a means of promoting the morale of active career personnel now serving with future retirement as their ultimate status.

There is an ald Chinese proverb which goes something like this: "To make long journey on foot, man must learn to take first step." This Association has long since learned that first step; it desires to achieve the stamina, the patience and the ability necessary to make the journey, however long, to attain the just purposes and objectives to which it aspires.

OUR GOVERNMENT IN ITS WHOLE CONSTITUTIONAL VIGOR MUST BE PRESERVED

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations,—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; . . . freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected,—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation."

—Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address—4 March 1801

Many letters received from our members and others record their praise of our editorial "Constitutional Liberties Endangered By World Government Proposals," which was published in the last issue of the Bulletin. That article was republished in the Congressional Record of Monday, 5 June 1950.

Although comments were overwhelmingly favorable, a few letters suggested that some form of "World Government" might be established by vesting such an organization with defined and limited powers which would not detract substantially from our present scheme of self-government under the Constitution and, that through the establishment and maintenance of such type of government, world peace could be achieved through enforced regulation.

The members who expressed such views, however, have uniformly agreed that the "World Government" concept, as suggested by the Chicago group's proposal for a "World Constitution," would be definitely dangerous, in that it would grant superior power to a government that is not our own. In view of that obvious conclusion, it is unmistakably clear that the granting of any executive, legislative or judicial powers we now enjoy under our present Federal Constitution to any form of "World Government," would inevitably lead to the very kind of "World Government" as proposed by the Chicago group, and would endanger our constitutional liberties. All such proposals should be vigorously opposed.

We believe that the high aims of peace might be achieved through international cooperation under long established principles of international relationships without the necessity of establishing a "World Government." We also believe that this can be done in a world organization, such as the United Nations organization, without granting to it attributes of sovereignty, provided there is a uniform desire and willingness on the part of the great nations for the peaceful settlement of international differences. Modern history has indicated that peace is not to be had merely by forms of organization or peace pacts; for the causes of conflicts are complex and often economically deep rooted. It has long been evident to students of history that the only remedy for war is the elimination of the causes of war. While this has heretofore been impossible, it is the ultimate hope of mankind as the only means of world peace.

The widespread support of the views expressed in our article on "World Government" in the last issue of the Bulletin comes from a vast majority of a group which venerates the traditions of valor and personal bravery passed on to our generation by the Founders of our Republic and those who have supported them. These traditions are embodied in the immortal document which the great British statesman, William E. Gladstone, described as, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man"—our Federal Constitution.

In view of the certain impairment of the constitutional guarantees for our national and individual welfare, patriotic Americans should be alert to all proposals for changing our constitutional setup and refrain from approving such pro-

(Continued on page 11)

THE COMMUNIST "PEACE PETITION" CAMPAIGN

On 13 July 1950, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued the following interim statement regarding the subject effort, which is of such great national interest, it is quoted in its entirety:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities has in preparation a report on the recently initiated Communist world-wide 'peace' offensive with particular reference to its significance in the United States. In connection with this report our attention has been called to a Nation-wide drive now being conducted by the Communists at meetings, on street corners, in shops, homes, and churches, in communities throughout the Nation, to secure signatures to a so-called 'peace petition.'

"We were particularly struck by the fact that Marcel Scherer, an individual with a long public record of Communist party affiliation and activities, who has been identified as closely associated with a Communist atomic espionage ring, appeared before our committee on June 21, 1950, and admitted that he was one of those in charge of this drive in the city of New York.

"Pending the publication of our full report which will take some time to prepare, it would be unfortunate if many Americans, unaware of the insidious aims and purposes of this drive, should be misled into lending their names and signatures to this spurious 'peace petition.' In conformance with its tradition of alerting the American people to current Communist practices, the committee has decided to issue this preliminary note of caution so that all may be properly forewarned and forearmed.

"It should be noted at the outset that the petitions are intended to confuse and divide the American people and paralyze their resistance to the march of Communist aggression. The petition drive is part of the present Soviet cold war against the United States to prepare the path for treason.

"Americans should not affix their signatures thoughtlessly to this appeal and should be aware of the implications and seriousness of their action. The names and addresses gathered by Communist solicitors will constitute a gigantic and invaluable RED MAILING LIST for the Communist Party, USA, and its headquarters in Moscow and numerous Communist-front organizations. This list will be used not only for the distribution of subversive literature throughout the country, but it will also serve as a means of blackmailing for years to come, those who may have innocently lent their names to 'peace petitions.'

"Strange as it may seem the present 'peace petition' drive occurs simultaneously while Soviet-made planes, tanks, and artillery are being used to launch a furious and unprovoked attack upon the peaceful republic of South Korea, an attack which President Truman has characterized as part of an effort to 'conquer independent nations' through 'armed invasion and war.'

"The text of the 'peace petition' as adopted in Stockholm on March 15-19, 1950, by the so-called World Peace Congress at the third session of its Permanent Committee, is announced to the world in the March 24, 1950, issue of 'For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!' official organ of the general staff of the international Communist conspiracy, the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties (Comiform). In conformity with this directive, the Communist Party, USA, formulated its own 'peace plan' in the Worker for June 11, 1950. Calling for a 'Nation-wide drive for millions of signatures,' every Communist is notified that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal.' On June 20, 1950, the 'peace petition' received the official stamp of approval from the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

"The petition itself is worded most deceptively. Oddly

(Continued on page 12)

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Existing laws governing dual employment and dual compensation impose severe restrictions upon retired officers of the uniformed services against accepting civilian employment under the Federal Government.

Our Association has been aware of this situation and has constantly and vigorously recommended appropriate revision of the present laws. It was through a letter addressed by our former President, Admiral Sellers, on 14 March 1947, to the then Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, which first brought to official light the views and desires of our Association upon that important subject, particularly as to the need for or appropriate modification of those restrictions. An identical letter was addressed by Admiral Sellers, on the same date, to the heads of each of the departments and agencies having jurisdiction over the uniformed services. In addition, a similar letter was addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States.

In those letters, Admiral Sellers stated in part:

"Under the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1894 (U.S.C. 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 62) and section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (U.S.C. 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 59a) retired officers of the military services are severely restricted in accepting civilian positions under the Federal Government. This is detrimental both to the individuals concerned and to the Government itself.

"Retired officers are prohibited from holding civilian positions under the Federal Government where either the rate of retired pay or the rate of compensation fixed for the civilian position amounts to $2,500 per annum unless (1) elected thereto, or (2) appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, or (3) retired because of battle injuries or incapacities incurred in line of duty. (5 U.S.C. sec. 62; 13 Comp. Gen. 60; 21 Comp. Gen. 1129.) Retired officers who receive more than $2,500 per annum may not avoid the application of this statutory provision by waiving their retired pay during the occupancy of the civilian position (14 Comp. Gen. 289).

"When a retired officer is eligible for employment in a civilian position under the Federal Government, he is subject to the dual compensation statute (5 U.S.C. sec. 59a), which limits the aggregate income from a Federal civilian position, whether elective or appointive, and retired pay to an amount not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

"The laws dealing with this subject are so complicated that retired officers are usually unable to determine their status without resort to legal counsel and frequently such counsel is unable readily to render authoritative advice. Governmental agencies will not pass judgment upon the status of a particular officer in advance of the acceptance of a civilian position by such officer. These agencies advise retired officers called upon to determine their status under the law to seek the advice of private counsel. Such a situation should not prevail.

"In 1946 the 79th Congress enacted Public Law 718 in accordance with the recommendation of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to authorize the appointment of retired officers and warrant officers to civilian positions in the Veterans Administration. This law, however, subjects all officers so employed to the restrictions contained in section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a).

"It is recommended that this matter be given consideration with a view to removing the present restrictions so that the Federal Government may have the benefit of the services of experienced retired military officers in civilian positions and to afford to these officers the same opportunity of service in the Government open to all citizens. In my opinion, section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 should

(Continued on page 13)

RESTRICTIONS AGAINST RETIRED OFFICERS MAKING SALES TO AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Our Association noted that Section 626 of H.R. 7786, the appropriation bill for the support of the Government for the fiscal year 1951, as introduced in the House, proposed to broaden the restrictions against payments of retired pay to retired officers of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who might be engaged in the sale of war materials or supplies *to any agency of the* Department of Defense.

Following is the section referred to: "Sec. 626. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this chapter to any officer on the retired list of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who for himself, or for others is engaged in the selling of, or negotiating for the sale of, to any agency of the Department of Defense, any war materials or supplies."

Enactment of that provision would have so broadened presently existing restrictions so as to prevent any retired officer of any of the regular establishments from making sales to any agency of the Department of Defense while at the same time receiving retired pay. Such action would have materially reduced the opportunity for gainful employment of retired officers in a very proper sphere of legitimate American business. More than that, it would have effected the present proper employment of many retired officers in lower ranks, with modest retired pay, by making unlawful that which has heretofore been lawful and proper.

Prior to unification of the armed services and adoption of a single appropriation act for the Department of Defense, provisions similar to the above appeared in the single appropriation acts for the War and Navy Departments. Such provisions, however, were limited to the activities of retired officers of the regular services in the respects covered by the restriction in each case to sales to the departments under which retired officers held retired status. For example, a retired officer of the regular Army, while prohibited from selling, contracting for, or negotiating for the sale of war materials or supplies to the Army, was not prohibited from such activities with reference to the Navy or the Marine Corps.

Our Association felt that no necessity for that provision existed, in view of the fact that adequate criminal laws govern the conduct of officials of the Government, active and retired, in business relationships with the Federal Government and for the further more basic reason that retired officers, in view of their character and the high traditions of the services in which their lives have been molded, are not in a class from which wrong-doing should be presumed.

Accordingly, it requested the Secretary of Defense to join in recommending elimination of the proposed provision. Similarly, the question was taken up with the Budget Officers of each of the three services (Army, Navy and Air Force).

In all of those places our Association found agreement that the proposed provision in the appropriation act should be eliminated.

Additionally our Association asked to be heard for the purpose of expressing its view both befose the House and Senate Appropriation Committees, where the following statement was made:

"It has come to the attention of the Retired Officers Association that there is under consideration by this Committee a proposed provision in the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, which, if enacted, would materially and adversely affect the opportunities of retired officers by

(Continued on page 14)

PROPOSED REFUND OF STATUTORY PAY WITHHELD BY ECONOMY LEGISLATION BETWEEN 1 JULY 1932 AND 30 JUNE 1934

S. 1119, a bill introduced by Sen. Jenner on 28 February 1949, was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Its purpose was to refund to commissioned officers or former commissioned officers of the uniformed services the increases in pay to which they were entitled, but did not receieve, as a result of actual promotions in rank between the dates 1 July 1932 and 30 June 1934. These increases in pay were withheld from those who would have otherwise been entitled to them had it not been for the manner in which the Economy legislation had been interpreted.

This proposed legislation was considered in hearings by a Sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on 3 March 1950, at which time our President, Admiral Hamlet, appeared and submitted the following statement outlining the Association's views with respect to the significance of this meritorious proposal:

I am Vice Admiral Harry G. Hamlet, United States Coast Guard, Retired. As President of the Retired Officers Association, composed of retired commissioned officers and warrant officers, regular and reserve, male and female, of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service, I appreciate your courtesy in notifying the Association of these hearings and thank you for the opportunity to appear and testify relative to the pending measure.

The bill as introduced would authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to pay to commissioned officers or former commissioned officers of any of the services named in the Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, a sum equal to the difference between the amount of pay and allowances received by such persons under such Act between July 1, 1932, and June 30, 1934, and the amount of pay and allowances which these officers would have received if section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932 had not been in effect during that period.

Section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932 required the suspension for the fiscal year 1933 of *automatic* increases in compensation of employees of the government, civilian and military, by reason of length of service or promotion. This suspension of *automatic* increases was continued in effect for the fiscal year 1934 by the provisions of the Economy Act of 1933 (Act of March 30, 1932; 48 Stat. 13).

Had the above mentioned provisions of law been applied equally to both military personnel and civilian employees of the government, there would be no justification for legislation at this time. Such, however, was not the case. As will be demonstrated, certain military officers were subjected to greater losses from their pay than were the majority of military personnel and all civilian employees of the government, for which losses restitution should now be made.

Section 201 of the Economy Acts in its application to military officers was interpreted not only to apply to longevity increases in pay for service or promotion which were *automatic* in character, but, with reference to military officers, this section was interpreted also to apply to withhold increases in pay due to actual promotions in rank—promotions which involved increases in responsibility and brought additional expenses to the officers concerned. The same interpretation did not apply to civilian employees of the government in view of the fact that section 202 of the Economy Acts withheld from such civilian employees increases in pay only for administrative promotions, but not for promotions in grade. In other words, the comparatively small group of military officers who were promoted during the fiscal years 1933 and 1934 were not only subjected to the pay reductions generally applicable to all employees of the government, civilian and military, but they were re-

(Continued on page 15)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

The practical administration of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 immediately raised many questions as to the interpretation of various provisions. In some cases opinions of the Judge Advocate Generals or the Comptroller General have been requested and obtained. Other instances of omissions in the crediting of service, in some cases theretofore allowed, have been detected. The various services and certain members of Congress and of the Armed Services Committees already realize that certain amendments will have to be proposed, considered and probably made to the Act. The Armed Services Committee Chairmen have taken the position that piece-meal amendment of the Act will not be desirable, except in instances where immediate action to extend effective dates has been necessary. It is anticipated that an omnibus bill, incorporating the required amendments to the Act that have become obvious through the attempted administration of the Act in its present form, will be offered early in the next Congress by the Department of Defense. Some of the omissions, inequities or desirable changes in the Act, insofar as they relate to retired officers, that have been observed by the Association's staff are commented on below:

REVIEW OF PHYSICAL DISABILITY CASES—Physical Disability Appeal Boards have been established within the various services to give reconsideration in cases where additional medical evidence is available to support claims for a percentage of physical disability higher than that determined upon in accordance with the Act.

Applications for such reconsideration must be made in writing to the service from which retired and be accompanied by such additional medical evidence or other documentary information relative to physical condition as of the *time of retirement* which it is felt is sufficient to justify a further review.

In this connection, it is pointed out that any officer who feels that the percentage of disability assigned him is in error should under no circumstances make his election until the matter of percentage of disability has been finally settled. Such election, once made, is final and irrevocable for all purposes. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that no election be made until all factors involved in such election have been definitely established.

Where any doubt exists as to any of the elements entering into an election, officers concerned should by no means make it on the basis of information at hand, but should wait until they are satisfied in every particular.

Since pay benefits under the subject Act are retroactive and the election may be made at any time prior to 1 October 1954, it would appear that there is no penalty attached to such delay except, of course, the hazard resulting from untimely death.

TAX EXCLUSION—Under laws prior to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, those retired for physical disability were entitled to 75% of their pay, all of which was excluded from gross income for income tax purposes. Under the new law all of their retired pay is thus excluded, provided the degree of physical disability established is 75% or more. Where the disability has been established at less than 75%, the retired pay is excluded to the extent of the degree of physical disability determined. For example, those who elect to have their pay computed on the basis of years of service times 2½% (not to exceed 75%) may exclude from their gross income for income tax purposes the amount of their retired pay to which they would have been entitled had they elected to receive their pay on the basis of degree of disability.

The manner of applying the income tax exclusion under the new law was the subject of a special release in the previous issue of the Bulletin, which outlined our under-

(Continued on page 17)

CREDIT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMAN SERVICE FOR THE PURPOSE OF LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Among the legislative proposals strongly favored and supported by our Association is Rep. Evins' bill (H.R. 7739), to extend credit for cadet-midshipman service during the periods 13 August 1898 to 5 July 1902 and 6 April 1917 to 12 November 1918, on the same basis as is now provided by law for those who performed similar service in World War II, for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans Administration.

Section 10 of the Act of 13 July 1943 extended credit for service at the service academies by cadets and midshipmen, during World War II, as active military or naval service for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans Administration. The Evins bill merely proposes to remove a discrimination which now exists against veterans by extending the same opportunities for service credit to those who served as cadets and midshipmen at our service academies during the Spanish-American War and World War I.

Enactment of the above measure would only provide equalization of war service pension rates for the widows of many who performed the type of service mentioned. It passed the House on 15 May 1950, but has thus far failed of favorable consideration by the Senate because of the press of more urgent business.

Notwithstanding the disappointment in the resulting delay in securing the benefits of such a law, the above is another legislative item which should be enacted. We shall renew our efforts to obtain favorable consideration in the next Congress, if not acted on during the remainder of the current session. Because of its true merit, we are hopeful that this matter will ultimately and, in the not too far distant future, receive final approval.

PRESENT STATUS OF RECALL OF RETIRED OFFICERS TO ACTIVE DUTY

No policy has yet been announced by any of the uniformed services concerning the involuntary recall of retired officers to active duty at this time.

In general, therefore, except on a voluntary basis where an officer possesses professional or technical experience, in which acute shortages exist, consideration is not presently being given toward the recall of retired personnel.

Where a retired officer with special qualifications desires recall, he should make request in writing to the Personnel Department of the service from which retired, stating his desire to return to active duty and outlining the specialized qualifications for which fitted.

Our understanding is that each individual request so submitted will be decided upon its own merit and the needs of the particular service.

REVIEW OF RECORDS OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS OFFICERS PASSED OVER FOR WARTIME PROMOTIONS

The bill S. 780 to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned Naval officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes, briefly noted under our legislative program in the 3rd Quarter-1950 Bulletin, was reported on 29 August by the House Armed Services Committee. Although the bill was entirely rewritten, the subject matter was not changed too greatly except in technical respects.

The purpose of the bill as amended by the Committee is to require a review to be made of the records of Navy-Marine Corps officers, together with officers of the Reserve components thereof, who failed of promotion as a result of the so-called panel action during the past war. The amended bill added Naval and Marine Corps Reserves to come within the terms of the bill and followed the suggestions this Association made in its statement to the Sub-committee to remove the initial limiting date of 30 June 1942, so that it now takes in all officers within the scope of the bill who failed of promotion at any time prior to 7 August 1947. In order to obtain a review of his record the officer must request a review within six months of the date of approval of the act. This puts the burden on the officer who desires a review and relieves the Department of the burden of reviewing all records of officers who failed of promotion.

Although not so stated in the report, it is understood the other armed services were not included in the bill for the reason the Committee was advised those services did not use a panel system of promotion during the war but continued to follow the statutory promotion system provided.

Now that the House Committee has reported on this bill, there is a reasonable possibility that it will be acted on in the House and reconsidered by the Senate prior to the recess or adjournment of the Congress for this session.

MEMBERSHIP EXPANSION

Current expansion of our membership is heartwarming indeed. During July alone, 869 new members were enrolled.

Reasonably to be expected is that membership expansion will continue as more and more officers are looking to this Association with confidence in its purposes and objectives and respect for the manner service is provided to those who are placing increased dependence upon it.

Present growth results, in a measure, from the extension of voting privileges to all members. A further significant development being placed in operation is the establishment of Associate Memberships for active officers.

With regard to Associate Memberships for those on active duty, our President made known that development to the Secretary of Defense and to the heads of all other agencies from the personnel of which our membership is drawn by letters explaining fully what such membership provides in the way of aid and benefit to the officers themselves and their dependents.

The problems of officers—regardless of status—are not dissimilar. That fact is borne out by the trend of service legislation and in the execution of our service to those who seek advice. Future experience, bearing upon those matters, will surely continue that tendency.

Since, therefore, the needs and desires of all officers follow the same general pattern, it is logical that our Association with its well planned organization and staff should expand to represent effectively the rights, opportunities and benefits of all officers, their dependents and survivors.

Our Association's present standing as a means of safeguarding and promoting the interests of all officers obtains from the proper manner in which its activities have been conducted over the years, and from the sound policies laid down by its leaders of wide experience and broad service background.

Modern miracles in industry were only possible because men learned to unite their forces and to act together. The same sound principle holds when we consider the rights, opportunities and benefits of officers now retired and those serving with a view to ultimate retirement.

Accordingly, it is with pleasure that we extend a cordial invitation to those on the active lists to join with us in the common task of maintaining an organization which is effective in behalf of expressing the needs and desires of all officers and their dependents.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP AVAILABLE TO OFFICERS OF THE ACTIVE LISTS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

As pointed out under remarks concerning membership expansion in the article above, our Association is now engaged in carrying out the action of its Board of Directors, 3 May 1950, by which Associate Membership was extended to all commissioned officers, warrent officers and nurses on the active lists of the uniformed services.

Great pleasure is taken in announcing that Vice Admiral Harry W. Hill, USN, Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy, became our first Associate Member. The action of the Association in bestowing Associate Membership No. 1 upon Admiral Hill results from the interest displayed by him in the Association and his application to become a member in 1948 when it was not possible, at that time, to admit members from the active lists. Shown below is a photograph noting the occasion when our President, Admiral Hamlet, presented to Admiral Hill his membership card.

Coincidently, our second Associate Member is Ensign F. C. Taylor, USN, a graduate from the Naval Academy with the Class of 1950, and is now serving aboard the destroyer McKEAN in the Pacific. Ensign Taylor's membership was a graduation gift from his father, Captain Francis Taylor, USN, Retired, an enthusiastic member and supporter of the Association residing in Farmington, Connecticut.

Vice Admiral Harry W. Hill, USN, receives Associate Membership card No. 1 from Admiral Hamlet in appropriate ceremony at the Naval Academy.

DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE TO RETIRED ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS

The Association has received numerous letters from its members relative to the failure to include in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 credit for certain National Guard service that was previously credited for pay purposes. The history of this omission also ties in with Public Law 810—80th Congress. On 28 June 1950, the Comptroller General in his Decision B-93525 ruled that certain Army Reserve officers who were retired erroneously or who have received a portion of their retirement pay based upon non-federally recognized service under the provision of Title III, Public Law 810, must make refund of the retirement benefits which have been so credited erroneously.

The Department of the Army in its letter to the Comptroller General, endeavored to justify the retention of erroneous payments on the basis that the retired officers were in a status of *de facto* retired officers, based on previous court decisions. The Comptroller General ruled that the court decisions do not govern in the instant case and that refunds would have to be made.

The basis upon which the majority of retirements or overpayments were effected erroneously in the cases of approximately 454 Army Reserve officers, retired under Public Law 810, resulted from credit given to non-federally recognized service in the National Guard of a state, which was not federal service as defined in Section 306 of Title III of that law.

Inasmuch as this situation, both as to retirement and to the overpayments, was due to an administrative error on the part of the Department of the Army, it is not the intention of the Army at this time to take action to collect the overpayments. It is under consideration in the Department as to what corrective steps can be taken and whether or not to apply for legislative remedial action.

In the event that legislation is sought and procured, the overpayments will not be collected. In any event the overpayments can be repaid by installment deductions from the retired pay if all is to be repaid within one year, and if a longer period of time is desired to make reimbursement, where hardship would otherwise result, a letter should be addressed to the Chief of Finance, setting up the circumstances and the amount that can be deducted from each months pay without causing undue hardship.

MONTHLY REPORTS OF EXISTENCE

Our President, Admiral Hamlet, took up with Secretary of the Army Pace by letter dated 18 July 1950, the subject of monthly reports of existence as presently required, under a Comptroller General's decision, to be filed by certain retired Army and Air Force personnel whose accounts were transferred recently from the Veterans Administration to the Department of the Army, in those cases where payments are made to banks, under powers of attorney, or to individuals residing outside the country. He stated it to be his understanding that procedure is not required or followed by some other disturbing agencies which make payments to retired or disabled military personnel who receive retired pay or pensions; that the filing of monthly reports of existence to entitle one to receive his monthly retired pay checks is an onerous requirement involving great inconvenience; and that the procedure must be a costly one to administer. Accordingly, it was strongly recommended that the matter be reconsidered by the Army and, if found justifiable, the practice be changed to one not requiring monthly reports of existence.

Major General E. M. Foster, USA, Chief of Finance, to whom the above letter was referred, stated in reply of 8

August 1950 that, since the practice referred to results from a Comptroller General's decision, it will be necessary to obtain consent of the Comptroller General before waiving the requirement. General Foster stated further he has asked that the matter be reconsidered and that we will be advised of determination reached.

RANK OF RETIRED OFFICERS UPON RECALL TO ACTIVE DUTY IN THE COAST GUARD

Public Law 207 (81st Congress—1st Session) had for its purpose to revise and codify Title 14, United States Code, with respect to laws pertaining to the Coast Guard.

Section 422 of that Act, prescribing the status of recalled personnel provides, "All retired personnel when recalled to active duty shall serve in the grade or rating in which they were serving at the time of retirement."

That provision, inasmuch as it affects adversely a number of our members, and is at variance with the general policy of the Navy, with which the Coast Guard would serve in the event of circumstances requiring involuntary recalls of retired personnel, was taken up with officials at Headquarters of the Coast Guard in Washington.

Attention was invited to the fact that, under conditions as above described, certain Coast Guard retired personnel recalled would find themselves at a great disadvantage by virture of a status considerably inferior to that enjoyed by their contemporaries of the Navy with whom they served during World War II. Similarly, such persons would be placed in positions subordinate to some Coast Guard personnel of far lesser service background and experience.

In the Navy all officers are recalled to duty in the rank in which they are placed on the retired list, with the exception of ranks established by combat citations. In the latter case, it was the intention of Section 412, Officer Personnel Act-1947, that all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps below flag rank be recalled in the ranks to which they were promoted by reason of combat citations, and that those of flag rank be recalled in that rank or the rank from which they were promoted by reason of combat citation, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

The laws of all the other Armed Forces likewise require restoration to duty in the rank in which members concerned are retired, rather than that in which they were serving immediately prior to retirement.

It was pointed out further that it is not illogical to assume that those who served satisfactorily in ranks higher than that held immediately prior to retirement would again perform satisfactorily should occasion arise to require their services.

Moreover, the majority of retired officers establish themselves in homes of their own, arrange for the uninterrupted education of their children, and incur other long-range economic committments, based upon their retired pay augmented by additional income in some cases, provided through civilian employment. Recall of those in that category would, under the provisions of the aforementioned section, impose financial hardship upon them and otherwise cause such disruption of their personal affairs as could well be a serious detriment to their morale and, consequently, their efficiency.

Should future world developments demand any large scale mobilization of military personnel, it is obviously in the best interests of the country and the services that those so mobilized, insofar as possible, be assigned duties and responsibilities commensurate with their proven abilities.

Our Association questions the advisability of a policy which requires the recall to active duty of officers of increased age, capabilities and experience in ranks more appropriate to younger men with less service and experience and, indeed, ranks from which those officers were actually promoted under wartime conditions in recognition of their general qualifications. It therefore feels that this whole matter should be reconsidered, and that the Coast Guard should establish administrative practices in this respect parallel to those followed in the other services.

The Coast Guard has published that future recalls of retired personnel would be made in conformance with Section 422 of the new Title 14, but that thereafter promotions might be, but not necessarily would be made to restore such personnel as may be recalled thereunder to the highest status in which they served satisfactorily during World War II and in which status they are now retired by reason of such satisfactory service.

Press releases issued recently by the other services urging former servicemen to volunteer for immediate assignment have all stressed that such restorations would be made in the highest ranks or ratings held satisfoctorily.

We have confidence that any future recalls of retired personnel in the Coast Guard will be made in such manner as will provide reestablishment, through promotion, to the highest ranks held satisfactorily, so as to accord its personnel treatment similar to that given by the other services. However, since Section 422 of the instant Act is definitely out of harmony with one of the fundamental principles of Defense unification, whereby uniformity of benefits and privileges is sought for all personnel throughout the military establishment on equal basis, the need for corrective amendment of the existing law is clearly indicated, so that benefits and privileges granted to personnel of the Coast Guard will be the same as those in the Navy and other components of the Armed Forces.

MARINE CORPS ANNIVERSARY EXHIBIT

Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, has requested that the following announcement be made concerning the Truxton-Decatur Naval Museum:

The Truxton-Decatur Naval Museum, located at 1610 H Street N.W., Washington, D. C., was recently opened by the Naval Historical Foundation, a non-profit body devoted to preserving and fostering the story of United States sea power. The initial exhibit to be on display until November 1950, features the period in which Commodores Truxton and Decatur played such a prominent part, that is, the Revolutionary War through the War of 1812. Commencing in November 1950, a special exhibit will feature the Marine Corps' 175 years of service to the Nation. In order for this exhibit to depict adequately the various activities and services of the Marine Corps, persons having knowledge of display items appropriate and available (on a loan basis) are requested to write or telephone Mr. Joel D. Thacker, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Room 3127 Arlington Annex, Washington 25, D. C. Telephone: REpublic 7400, extension 71473 or 71491.

ACCESS TO SERVICE RECORDS BY ARMY RETIRED OFFICERS

In connection with answering requests for information from retired Army officers who question the findings as to the degree of physical disability and desire advice as to the procedure, the Retired Officers Association inquired of the Adjutant General's office of the Army as to the right of retired Army officers to examine their records for this purpose. Specifically, the requests related to an examination of the records for the purpose of determining the basis of their physical disability. It was learned that, until the present time, while officers on the active list of the Army are permitted access to their records, retired Army officers have

not been permitted such access, nor have their attorneys been permitted access.

As a result of our inquiry in this matter, and our request that retired Army officers and their attorneys be permitted such access, our Association has been informed that the Adjutant General will shortly issue instructions permitting examination of their official records by retired Army officers and their attorneys to the same degree and in the same manner as is provided for officers on the active list of the Army and their attorneys. In addition, we have been informed that the Adjutant General will answer written requests for information as to the basis for the determination of the degree of physical disability.

This action should materially assist retired Army officers who are uncertain as whether to request reconsideration of the degree of physical disability assigned.

CAPTAIN STEPHEN E. RICE, USNR, RETIRED, NOMINATED BY PRESIDENT FOR U.S. TAX COURT BENCH

On 5 September 1950, President Truman nominated Captain Stephen E. Rice, USNR, Retired, to be a judge of the United States Tax Court.

Captain Rice graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy with the class of 1926 and served on active duty until 1928, when he resigned. Thereafter he attended Columbia University Law School and practiced in New York City.

He served in the office of the Legislaitve Counsel of the Senate from 1933 to 1942.

In December 1942, he went on duty as an officer of the Naval Reserve. He rose to the rank of commander and, during active service in the Pacific, received combat wounds as a result of which he was later retired in the rank of captain.

After retirement from the Navy, he resumed his duties as Legislative Counsel of the Senate.

The appointment of Captain Rice to this important judgeship, for which he was one of those recommended by the American Bar Association, was based upon his extensive understanding of our tax laws and broad knowledge of their application.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A Uniform Code of Military Justice was recently enacted as Public Law 506—81st Congress, approved 5 May 1950. Its purpose—to unify, consolidate, revise and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard.

Listed among those persons subject to the Code are: Retired personnel of a regular component of the armed forces who are entitled to receive pay; and Retired personnel of a reserve component who are receiving hospitalization from an armed force. (Art. 2 (4) and (5))

Of interest further to retired officers, in this connection, is that pursuant to Art. 88 and 89 any person subject to the Code shall be punished as a court-martial may direct who —"uses contemptuous words against the President, Vice President, Congress, Secretary of Defense, or a Secretary of a Department, a Governor or a legislature of any State, Territory, or other possession of the United States in which he is on duty or present"; or "behaves with disrespect towards his superior officer."

Under Art. 140, Sec. 10 of the subject law, the President may, at any time, drop from the rolls of any armed force any officer who, having been found guilty by the civil authorities of any offense, is finally sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution.

ASSOCIATION'S FIRST SCHOLARSHIP LOAN AWARDED

First loan to be awarded under the Association's Scholarship Program was made on 13 June 1950 to Mr. Robert Craig Hamner, a successful candidate for appointment as midshipman to the U.S. Naval Academy.

Mr. Hamner is the son of Colonel George C. Hamner, USMC, Retired. His home is in West Palm Beach, Florida.

The Association's Scholarship Program was established in October 1948 and developed entirely through voluntary contributions to assist worthy sons and daughters of retired Officers (living or deceased) who because of economic limitations, are unable to meet all required expense for entrance into service academies and civilian colleges or universities of their choice. It was later expanded in September 1949 to provide financial assistance to worthy sons and daughters of retired officers in need of such aid during the course of a college or university education.

Loans under the Association's Scholarship Program are granted upon authorization by the Board of Governors, which administers the fund, in needy cases, based upon highest character, scholastic aptitude and need, not to exceed $300, except in the case of entrance to the Naval Academy where the required deposit upon entrance has been increased to $350. Loans are coupled with an agreement by the recipient to repay the amount received as soon as he or she is able to do so after graduation or termination of attendance at the institution in connection with which the loan was made.

Applications for scholarship loans to help finance higher education for worthy sons and daughters of retired officers (living or deceased) who cannot supply all necessary costs in connection therewith will be welcomed by the Association.

Such applications for scholarship loans should, however, be accompanied by full and complete information and supported by written evidence as to need, scholastic ability and character references from reputable persons living in the vicinity in which the applicant resides.

RESTRICTIONS TO RETIRED OFFICERS FOR EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1949

Attention of all retired officers is invited to the following penalty contained within the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (Public Law 329—81st Congress, 1st Session) regarding active employment or participation thereunder:

> "Sec. 412. Whoever offers or gives to anyone who is now or in the past two years has been an employee or officer of the United States any commission, payment, or gift, in connection with the procurement of equipment, materials, or services under this Act, and whoever, being or having been an employee or officer of the United States in the past two years, solicits, accepts, or offers to accept any such commission, payment, or gift, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment for not to exceed three years, or both."

Unlike the prohibitive features respecting the sale of war materials or supplies to the Government in the Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1951 (reported elsewhere in this edition), the provisions of which apply only to retired officers of the regular services, the penalty imposed under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, above quoted, is applicable to retired officers of both regular and Reserve components.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Elsewhere in this issue there are separate extensive articles on several bills before the Congress that are of prime importance to the membership, and on which there has been the greatest activity or which have been in a legislative situation where action by the Committees or the Congress was possible.

As stated in the 3rd Quarter-1950 Bulletin, the Association has requested to be heard on 28 legislative proposals before various Committees of the Senate and House. Only a few of these proposals have been called for hearing. Representatives of the Association have appeared on the following bills:

One of these bills is H.R. 6813, introduced 17 January 1950, and referred to the House Armed Services Committee. This is a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payments of claims arising from the Correction of Military or Naval Records. A Sub-committee held hearings on this bill 13 June and your President, Admiral Hamlet, appeared before the Committee and made a statement favoring enactment. Because of a letter from the Comptroller General that was before the Committee in which certain objections were interposed the Sub-committee held the matter over to obtain oral testimony from the office of the Comptroller General. The Association has been informed that if time can possibly be found, the Sub-committee will hold further hearings on this bill. We believe that the Committee considers that the bill has merit and favors it, unless sound reasons are advanced by the Comptroller General for not enacting such a law.

This Association also recommended favorable action on the Bill, S. 1507, which permits Reserves on active duty to elect to draw either active duty pay or their retired pay. This bill had passed the Senate in June 1949 and had been referred to the House Armed Services Committee. A favorable report was made by that Committee on 29 August 1950. The Comptroller General had held in 1948 that Section 10 of the Act of 2 August 1946 (60 Stat. 854) did not permit members of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve to waive pension or retired pay so as to permit the receipt of active duty pay and allowances while serving on active duty. The bill, if enacted into law, will permit Reserve members of all the armed forces to make election as to which pay they will receive, and will also legalize payments to personnel who have heretofore waived or surrendered pension or retirement pay. The bill was amended so as to terminate it after five years.

The legislative program of the Association has been thrown out of gear for this session of Congress by two principal factors, namely: (1) the Omnibus Appropriation Bill for all of the Government departments, as this new form of bill seemingly took considerably more time for consideration and enactment than the previous separately submitted appropriation bills; and (2) the great amount of emergency legislation required to be considered and acted on as a result of the hostilities in Korea. The Committees were just beginning to take up bills of other than major importance when the Korean situation broke.

A new Survivor Benefit Bill, H.R. 8035, was introduced 5 April 1950 by Rep. Kilday and referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Hearings were begun on this bill on 12 June. Witnesses were called from the various armed services who testified in favor of the bill. Insurance actuaries were also called and heard by the Committee. On the last day your Association was called upon for a statement which was presented favoring the proposal generally, but recommending more liberal or practical proposals than were set up in the bill as introduced. The question of the cost of the bill as it related to the survivors of retired officers was gone into thoroughly at the hearings and it appeared to be the feeling of the Committee that the bill was not satisfactory in its present form and that further hearings and probably some change in the proposed methods of setting up the Survivor Benefit Funds would have to be devised. It is doubtful that further hearings will be held on this complicated problem during this session of the Congress in view of all the conditions that now exist.

The numerous bills to review retirement and promotion laws, to establish review boards for personnel retired for physical disability and to provide promotion of retired officers called to active duty during World War II, have all been placed in an inactive status both within the departments and before the Congressional committees by the priority given defense legislation.

The House Armed Services Sub-committee held hearings on two Bills, H.R. 7348 and H.R. 7752, the purpose of which bills was to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffered disability or death from injuries or disease while performing active service for short periods of time. This Association had a representative appear at the hearings with a prepared statement supporting the bills. However, the only two witnesses were Reps. Lanham of Georgia and Ford of Michigan who introduced the bills. Further action on the bills was held up for the purpose of permitting representatives of the Army and Navy to get together on certain amendments to the bills that appeared necessary for proper administration within the respective services.

The two proposals in Congress to credit Cadet-Midshipman service for pay and retirement purposes, S. 631 and H.R. 7246, both failed of Committee action due to the changed legislative situation in Congress created by the heavy program of defense legislation. It was felt that both Committees were favorable to this proposal if it had been possible to hold hearings on the bills.

The same situation obtained with respect to the Bill, H.R. 7739, which would credit Cadet-Midshipman service for purposes of Veterans Administration laws. This bill had passed the House and was about to be given consideration by the Senate Finance Committee. It is hoped that all of these bills will be reintroduced and promptly acted on during the next Congress.

The question of hospital facilities and outpatient services for retired officers and dependents of both retired and active officers is certain to receive early consideration in the next Congress, if not acted on before this Congress finally adjourns. A new Bill, H.R. 9500, was introduced 23 August by Rep. Rivers, and one short hearing on the bill was held. This bill will probably be classed as emergency legislation and further hearings and action may be expected.

Of possible interest, present or future, to retired personnel and their dependents is the enactment of H.R. 5920 into Public Law 569. This law provides a simple and inexpensive method of payment of amounts due mentally incompetent members of the uniformed services to persons designated by the Secretary of the services concerned without the requirement of appointment of a committee, guardian or other legal representative.

QUOTATIONS FROM GEORGE WASHINGTON

"Labour to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire—conscience."

(From Schoolboy copy-book of Washington)

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

(From First Annual Address to both Houses of Congress)

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world."

(From Farewell Address—17 September 1796)

PREAMBLE TO THE BY-LAWS OF THE ASSOCIATION

To inculcate and stimulate love of our Country and the flag; to defend the honor, integrity and supremacy of our National Government and the Constitution of the United States; and to advocate military forces adequate to the defense of our Country;

To foster fraternal relations between all branches of the various services from which our members are drawn;

To aid the retired personnel of the various services from which our members are drawn in every proper and legitimate manner; and

To present their rights and interests when service matters are under consideration, we unite to form the RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION'S NATIONAL CONVENTION

Greetings were dispatched to the Fleet Reserve Association on the occasion of its 23rd National Convention, held in Long Beach, California, 2-4 September 1950.

In that message, our President, Admiral Hamlet, complimented the Fleet Reserve Association on the high purposes and objectives which have guided so successfully its progress in the past, and expressed the assurance that continued success will attend its high aims for the future.

The program of the Fleet Reserve Association serves as a means of upholding high standards of morale among present and former enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps through its efforts to maintain those benefits and privileges which are so necessary in securing the best possible men for those services.

Vice Admiral J. W. Roper, Chief of Naval Personnel, who was unable to attend, sent a letter outlining the Navy's present personnel program in its relation with Fleet Reserve activities.

Rear Admiral W. D. Baker, USN, Commandant, 11th Naval District, representing Secretary of the Navy Matthews, was the principal speaker. He rendered an inspiring address calling upon the members to "carry on" their good work—a vital factor toward Navy efficiency.

ANNUAL CONVENTION—RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States held its 24th National Convention 28 June-1 July 1950 at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

A large assembly of delegates from the 48 states and overseas stations in attendance were addressed by President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, both of whom saw service as Reserve officers.

Keynote of the convention was—a strong, ready Reserve in all the Armed Services as a leading factor toward the preservation of American independence.

Our Association felicitates the Reserve Officers Association on its truly patriotic purposes and objectives. We heartily support those of its high aims, concerning which Secretary Johnson stated: "With your help we will harvest a rich crop in terms of adequate defense. I believe we will, with God's blessing, achieve the peace which all Americans so devoutly seek."

OUR GOVERNMENT—Continued from page 3

posals, however plausibly they are presented. We should be aware that some such proposals are made by those with possible inimical purposes which have not been clearly set forth or explained. In the parallel column on this page is one such proposal.

We should be especially alert to the fact that there are also those who, through the medium of agreements with undisclosed objectives, are actually weakening our domestic law and our form of constitutional government that has protected us for more than 160 years.

Constitutional dangers, comparable to the present, have been foreseen by statesmen of other countries. Among them was William Pitt who, with reference to our Federal Constitution, once observed that—"It will be a pattern for all future constitutions and the admiration of all future ages." We, who received such a heritage, must not permit it to be weakened or encroached upon in any respect, lest it be entirely destroyed, and we and future generations deprived of our birthright.

The people of this nation certainly do not wish to be victimized or enslaved through any form of "World Government" that might be organized and directed under a proposed "World Constitution." They are determined to remain free to worship according to the dictates of their conscience, free to write and speak within the limitations as designated by laws of their own making, free to be taxed according to their constitutional methods and not at the erratic and capricious will of a world potentate who perhaps could not distinguish between capital assessments and unjust taxation.

Why should a great and free people give alien agencies any power and control over their vast reservoir of actual and potential wealth—our national resources? The "World Government" advises that "Plans for improvement of the world's physical facilities, either public or private, and for the productive exploitation of resources and inventions shall be submitted to the (planning) agency or to such development authorities or regional sub-agencies as it may establish. The (planning) agency shall pass judgment on the social usefulness of such plans." The meaning of this provision is unmistakably clear. Not satisfied with our gold, our banks and credits, our Atom and H-Bombs, they would take from us our natural resources as well as our liberties.

In effect, the proposed "World Constitution" would abolish or weaken our Bill of Rights, those first ten amendments to our Federal Constitution, phrased by the great Virginian, George Mason, which comes to us through English jurisprudence, after their principles had been established and tested in England against considerable resistance. These tried precepts form the keystone of our civil liberties. Our Bill of Rights would go with the disappearance of our Federal Constitution and our Form of Government. Shall we permit this to happen?

The establishment of a "World Government" under a "World Constitution," however limited the initial grant of power and authority might be would, in our opinion, ultimately and inevitably mean the abolition of our Federal Constitution with all of our traditional rights and the protection under it. The proposal would result in the elimination of our laws concerning emigration and immigration and the movements of peoples. The proposal would eventually mean that freedom to enter our country would be extended to all peoples, regardless of their political and moral views, or degree of assimilability, and would permit to enter our country those we consider undesirable, including elements which may be hostile to our traditions of freedom.

The "World Government" proposes to assume direction of all Armed Forces. Thus, our Armed Forces would pass from U.S. control to that of "World Government." With that would pass our right to organize, direct and dispose of tions would be under the control of the Chamber of Guard-

the constituent parts. Insofar as we would be permitted to have our own Federal military forces, they would be in the nature of a police guard. Our military groups would not follow the Stars and Stripes, as our National Flag would no longer exist as our primary symbol of loyalty and patriotism. The Commander-in-Chief of our military forces would not be our duly elected President. As a matter of fact, the powers of our President, as now exercised under the Constitution, would no longer obtain. Even the office of President, as we now know it, would be abolished.

Two provisions of the "World Constitution" are of particular importance: "The limitation and control of weapons and of the Domestic Militias in the several component units of the world republic" is one of its functions, and "The control and use of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of the World (of which ours would be a part) shall be assigned to a chamber of guardians under the chairmanship of the (World) President in his capacity as protector of the peace," is another.

Quoting further from the "World Constitution," officers holding professional or active rank in the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic, or in the Domestic Militia of any component unit thereof, shall not be eligible as Guardians." These Guardians are to have the control and use of the Armed Forces of the Republic of the World—a situation that requires the closest scrutiny by members of the Armed Services of all Nations.

Military appropriations would not longer be within the scope of the powers of our Federal Congress; all appropriations. Appropriations for retired pay of officers, pensions and similar benefits no longer would exist. Active duty compensation would be subject to the same control. Many patriots of unimpeachable record in the line of duty, whose vitality is lessening with the passing of years, would probably be deprived of their well-earned financial assistance.

We need no super-state to sap the vitality of our Federal Union. We desire no super-constitution to weaken, destroy or supersede our Federal Constitution. We are satisfied with its wise checks and balances when they are properly observed. We take pride in our tripartite system of Government and insist that each branch of it shall not be unduly encroached upon. We are a republic guided by a Federal Constitution and wish to remain so. We must protect our inalienable rights. In connection with such dangers as now face us, Stanley Baldwin once stated: "It will be for you to protect democracy . . . it must be defended from without and it equally may have to be defended from within." This can best be done by becoming aware of the threats which confront us in connection with erroneous proposals for the establishment of a super-world organization which, based upon untenable assumptions, is being aggressively advocated in an organized propaganda as the only means of achieving peace.

The full implications of such proposals must be investigated, studied and understood by all, lest—through acceptance of plausible, but impracticable, panaceas for world peace—freedom under constitutional government is to become a mere memory in our Nation.

PEACE PETITION—Continued from page 3

enough, its sponsors who condone, defend, and support the present outrageous onslaught against the peaceful South Korean Republic, as well as every form of totalitarian tyranny and brutality, address themselves to 'all people of good will.' Thus they hope to entrap individuals who are uninformed about Communist wiles. At the bottom of the document is a quotation from Trygve Lie intended to give the false impression that the Secretary of the United Nations has given his approval to the petition. The appeal is backed by no reputable organization or individuals. It carries union label 209 which is to be found on numerous pieces of Communist Party literature.

"It carries a postoffice-box number rather than a well-known address, for the obvious purpose of concealing the fact that the proposed recipient of the mail is a person identified before a congressional committee as an active member of the Communist Party, namely, Elizabeth Moos, the mother-in-law of William Walter Remington, now under indictment for perjury relating to his Communist Party membership.

"Well aware that the United States, for its own protection against Soviet aggression, has established superiority in the development of atomic weapons, the Communists in their petition hope to paralyze our Armed Forces by demanding 'the outlawing of the atomic weapons as instruments of aggression.' The demand flies in the face of the fact that our Government, being answerable to the American people and bound by constitutional processes, cannot and does not unloose surprise acts of aggression as dictatorships have done repeatedly in recent years, and as the Communist forces did recently in Korea.

"The second misleading demand in the petition is for 'strict international control' of atomic weapons. Authorized representatives of the American Government in the field of atomic energy have pointed out that international control is impossible without provision for international inspection of plants within each country by an international authority. Under these conditions, the United States generously offered before the United Nations to turn over to the international authority all the materials, facilities, and know-how in our possession, as well as the disposal of all atom bombs and other atomic weapons. Every nation in the world except Soviet Russia and her satellites accepted the American plan as fair, generous, and workable.

"It is to incite Americans against their own Government and to tie its hands in the face of the aggression designs of a foreign nation that the petition demands that 'any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country * * * should be dealt with as a war criminal.' The position of the United States is that it does not intend to give up its atomic weapons except under a system of control sufficiently effective to guarantee that other nations do not have, and cannot secure, these weapons. Though they may not be aware of it, those who sign the 'peace petition' are in fact proposing that our country commit national suicide.

"Though labeld as a 'peace petition,' the document is actually intended to be the entering wedge for a campaign of civil disobedience and defiance of our Government, in the interests of the war effort of a foreign nation. Commenting on this 'peace movement,' Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, ranking woman leader of the Communist Party, tells Daily Worker readers: 'Don't be nervous about signing your name and address. You're on J. Edgar Hoover's list of 1,000,000 already. You ought to be insulted if you are not.'

"The Committee on Un-American Activities desires to acquaint the American people with the facts in regard to the most recent and active effort of the Communist Party in this country. We have every confidence that, knowing the facts, Americans will treat this latest manifestation of Communist chicanery with deserved contempt."

We are informed that the Committee expects to have its report, mentioned in the first quoted paragraph above, available for distribution within about a month. Those wishing a copy should address their requests to—The Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DUAL COMPENSATION—Continued from page 4

be repealed and the Act of July 31, 1894 repealed or so modified as to permit the employment of retired military officers in civilian positions under the Federal Government."

Secretary Forrestal, in his reply dated 1 May 1947, stated: "I recognize the need for clarification of the subject (dual compensation), as pointed out in your letter, and have instructed the Chief, Office of Industrial Relations, to confer with officials of the Civil Service Commission with request that consideration be expedited in order that Congress may consider the specific recommendation made."

Late in 1948, the need for modification of existing laws governing dual compensation, in their application to retired officers of the uniformed services, was again taken up with Mr. Forrestal, who was then serving as Secretary of Defense, pointing out that a condition of mutual denial prevails as a result of the present restrictions, whereby competent individuals desiring to serve in such capacities are not permitted to do so and, at the same time, the Government is deprived of the services of individuals who, by training and experience, are ably fitted to serve it loyally and well—services the Government sorely needs—for example, in the development of atomic energy and other specialized technical fields.

In his reply, Secretary Forrestal stated in effect that maximum effort would be made by the Department of Defense to support the Association's proposed changes.

During the past few years there have been numerous bills, previously reported and commented upon in the Bulletin, introduced in Congress proposing in one way or another to modify the present restrictions. Those bills, except for two presently to be discussed, were proposals of individual legislators for the most part suggesting raising or eliminating the $3,000 limitation imposed by section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932.

After more than two years of study jointly by the Department of Defense and the Civil Service Commission, the Commission on behalf of the Executive Branch of the Government submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives a proposal to consolidate and modify the existing restrictions by repealing all former laws dealing with the subject and enacting a new law covering a comprehensive simplification of the laws relating to the receipt of dual compensation under dual employment with the Government. As a result of that recommendation two similar bills were introduced: S. 2351 by Sen. Johnston, Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and H.R. 6356 by Rep. Murray, Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The above mentioned bills, as introduced, propose the repeal of all former laws and enactment of a single statute which would preserve the opportunities of those retired as the result of combat wounds and those retired for physical disability and also extend to those retired for other reasons an opportunity to serve our Government in civilian positions by permitting them to waive receipt of retired pay during the period of such employment, or to receive compensation from both capacities not to exceed $5,000. The bills thus propose an increase in the upper limit of dual compensation from the existing $3,000 figure to $5,000.

S. 2351 was passed by the Senate on 27 September 1949, having been reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, without hearing, in reliance upon the recommendation which had been made by the Civil Service Commission. The bill was referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on 28 September 1949.

A Sub-committee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which Rep. McCarthy of Minnesota is Chairman, held hearings on S. 2351 and the House bill, H.R. 6356, during the month of March 1950, at which time the Civil Service Commission and various other organizations and individuals interested in the subject testified. Captain Willenbucher, our Executive Vice President, appeared on behalf of the Association and testified as follows:

"The Retired Officers Association, by the very nature of the composition of its membership, has for a long time been vitally interested in the effect of the laws relating to dual employment within the United States government and the restrictions on the receipt of dual compensation where employed upon its numerous members and all retired officers of the uniformed services. It has long been considered that the limitations and restrictions placed upon such dual employment and dual compensation are much too rigid. They have been detrimental to the best interests not only of the individual but, more important, of the United States government as a whole. Retired personnel of the uniformed services have received their training and experience during their active service to the government and, because of these drastic limitations and restrictions, their services in civilian capacities after their retirement have been denied to the government, and they themselves have been denied the opportunity of serving their government as may other citizens of the United States. The talents and abilities of many retired military personnel who are specialists in certain fields may not be used by the government in civilian capacities because of the limitations and restrictions which the government itself has established. Thus, our government has, in this respect, erected a barrier against its own efficiency.

"While our Association has been interested in this subject for a long time and has recommended revision of the present laws, the most recent pronouncement of the Association was at its biennial convention held in Washington, D.C., on 17 February 1950, when a resolution covering this subject was passed. A copy of that resolution is appended to this statement. May I read the resolution?

"It is a pleasure to testify at these hearings on a bill which so comprehensively deals with the whole question of dual employment and dual compensation. It is realized that thorough study was devoted to this important problem and the bills before the Committee both comprehensively deal with the subject.

"The purpose stated in the title of the bills, to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employment under the United States, broadly states the principles proposed in the bills. The legislation, when enacted, will release to useful purposes a hitherto wasting asset by making experienced retired military personnel available to contribute to the conduct of efficient government by permitting employment of some from among these loyal, trained citizens in the service of their government.

"The Retired Officers Association strongly recommends the enactment of legislation which will simplify and consolidate the existing laws applicable to dual employment and dual compensation. In making this recommendation the Association has but one suggestion. In the opinion of the Association, the limitation of $5,000 set up in section 1 of the bill as the combined total compensation which one may receive in certain cases would continue a restriction upon the utilization by the government of the services of many retired personnel whose services should be available to the government. The presently existing limit is $3,000, as provided in the Economy Act of 1932. Thus the proposed increases will be only $2,000, which would not provide a change sufficiently adequate to accomplish substantial improvement in the presently existing situation.

"When the Economy Act of 1932 was passed and the present limitation governing dual compensation was placed at $3,000, it was done for the purpose of spreading em-

ployment. Since the passing of the depression of the 1930's that purpose has become less a necessity. Now the problem is one of acquiring adequate numbers of competent people by the government to carry on its work in this highly technical and specialized age, and this source of trained personnel should be available. Furthermore, in 1932, when the $3,000 limit was fixed, and for some time before and after 1932, the dollar was much more valuable than it is today and wage scales were much lower. The proposed increases of the limitation in the bill to $5,000 does not adequately raise the limit, if a limit must be maintained at all, to compensate for the difference in the value of the dollar then and its value today and the change in prevailing wage scales.

"In view of this situation, and of the necessity of making it possible for the federal government to select individuals from this competent group and to improve the opportunity of the individuals presently affected by the restrictions imposed upon them to follow pursuits open to other American citizens, our Association feels that the presently existing limitation should be entirely removed or, if in the wisdom of Congress a limitation is considered necessary, that it should be placed at a more realistic figure, for example $7,500, and our Association strongly recommends the one action or the other."

(NOTE: The resolution mentioned in paragraph two of the above statement is not here repeated, since it was reported as adopted Resolution No. 4, p. 3, 2nd Qrtr-1950 Bulletin)

The latest information from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is that the Sub-committee has ordered the bill reported to the full Committee. A Committee Print of the bill as so reported retains the proposed $5,000 limit for the combined amounts of retired pay and other compensation, with the privilege of election to receive either where one exceeds that amount. A new provision is one that would exclude the retired pay of commissioned officers, as well as other personnel, retired under Public Law 810—80th Congress.

If the Congress continues in session, or returns in November, it is quite possible that the bill will be acted on by the Committee and the Congress before final adjournment.

If action is not taken despite the continued and determined efforts of this Association, we will renew our activities at the beginning of the next Congress to secure early consideration and passage of this legislation which is of such importance to many retired officers and those to be retired.

RESTRICTIONS SALES—Continued from page 4

limiting the nature of business in which they may engage.

"The provision referred to reads as follows:

> 'No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the regular Army, regular Navy, regular Marine Corps, or regular Air Force who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense any war materials or supplies.'

"The effect of the inclusion of this section in the appropriation bill for the entire Department of Defense would so broaden restrictions on the use of money appropriated for the armed services that retired officers would be unable to engage in occupations heretofore open to them.

"The combining of the Departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force under one head as the Department of Defense materially changes the relationship of these officers to the departments of which they were not formerly, while on active duty, a part. Before these armed services were combined under one head, separate appropriation bills were enacted for each of the departments. Provisions similar to that above quoted have appeared in appropriation acts for the War and Navy Departments. Those provisions, however, prohibited payments from the respective appropriations to regular officers on the retired lists who engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of any war materials or supplies only to the departments under which they held retired status. As the laws then applied, a retired officer of the regular Army, although prohibited from selling, contracting for or negotiating for the sale of war material or supplies to the Army was not prohibited from such activity with reference to the Navy, Marine Corps or the Air Force.

"The Retired Officers Association, the membership of which is composed of over 17,000 retired officers of the *regular* services and their reserve components, has long been and is now of the opinion that the then existing restrictions were discriminatory and unnecessary in their effect upon the opportunities of retired officers of the *regular* services in the pursuit of gainful employment that was open to other retired government personnel, military and civilian, and to all other American citizens. Under a composite appropriation bill for all the departments, the inclusion of such a restriction would so broaden the scope that the discrimination and unfairness become even more apparent.

"The discrimination above mentioned lies in the fact that the provision which it is proposed to inculde in the composite appropriation bill for the Department of Defense affects only retired officers of the regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. Similar to the restrictions contained in the separate appropriation bills, this restriction would not apply to retired officers of the reserve components of the military services that comprise the Department of Defense, nor is there any similar provision in other appropriation acts or legislation affecting retired officers of the other services, who are similarly treated by the Congress in laws relating to pay and retirement privileges, that is to say, the regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service. Likewise there is no similar provision affecting retired civilian employees of the government or retired members of Congress. Thus, only retired officers of the *regular* Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Airy Force have been and would be restricted as to their opportunities to engage in certain types of business open to all other American citizens.

"The effect of the mere existence of the provision include in former appropriations acts covering this subject has on innumerable occasions resulted in the inability of retired officers obtaining employment with firms doing business with the government, even though the individuals would not have been engaged in activities which could be looked on as within the restriction. This position has been taken by many commercial concerns to insure that they could not be remotely criticized for their employment policy, which situation further materially reduces the opportunities of all retired regular officers under the existing retirement policy, and particularly those retired in lower grades with comparatively low rates of retired pay.

"There are in the statute books stringent criminal laws

providing punishments for all types of fraud, bribery, corruption and wrongdoing in the conduct of business with the federal government. It is the opinion of the Retired Officers Association that these laws are adequate to prevent all types of wrongdoing or, if not, that they should be made so. The prevention of wrongful acts should be attained by the imposition of direct penalties and not through the medium of nebulous prohibitions susceptible of broad and varying interpretations as to government contractors and retired officers. Retired officers are also subject to the same discipline and penalties, not only for wrongdoing, but for impropriety in conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, as they were under while on the active lists.

"It should be noticed that, under the laws relating to wrongdoing in the conduct of business with the federal government, whenever any officer is found guilty under such laws his retired pay is automatically stopped. Therefore the general laws governing such conduct and the specific laws governing the conduct of officers on the retired lists of any of the regular services positively prevent wrongdoers from being paid from defense appropriations. Where, then, is there any necessity for a general provision in an appropriation act which unnecessarily restricts all retired officers of the regular services, whether or not found guilty of misconduct?

"Since the Government is adequately protected against wrongdoing by direct and positive laws, the Retired Officers Association is of the opinion that regulation of the conduct of retired officers in business activities with the Government should not be written into any appropriation act.

"As an expression of the sense of the entire Association at its biennial convention held in Washington, D. C., on 17 February 1950, a resolution was passed which I request permission to read and append as part of my statement.

"The Association believes that the careful consideration the Committee will give to the effect of the proposed provision upon all retired officers of the regular services and the discrimination which it would impose upon them, will result in deleting this provision from the pending bill. It is recommended that such action be taken."

(NOTE: The resolution above mentioned is not here repeated, since it was reported as adopted Resolution No. 8, p. 4, 2nd Qrtr-1950 Bulletin)

As a direct result of the recommendations of our Association and full support of them by the services concerned, the Senate Appropriations Committeee recommended elimination of Section 626 from the Appropriation Act, but recommended further the substitution of a new Section 1115, which is as below quoted: "Sec. 1115. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials."

The House conferees accepted the Senate proposals on this subject. The entire bill was cleared for the President and became the "General Appropriation Act, 1951" on 6 September 1950.

Consequently, as far as the receipt of retired pay is concerned, the present restriction now extends to retired officers of the regular uniformed services only during the two year period next after retirement. After that time there is no restriction imposed by the General Appropriation Act, 1951.

It must be realized, however, that the above law has only to do with the restrictions against the receipt of retired pay when engaged in the sale of war materials and supplies to agencies of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. There are criminal statutes which apply to this field, notably 18 U.S.C. 281, that prohibit any officer of the Government to contract with the Government for himself or on behalf of others. This provision of law was amended in 1940 to exempt retired officers from this restriction, except as to sales to any agency of the Government under which they hold retired status.

In its report on the bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee acknowledged its sympathy to the pleas of those who recommended removal of the restrictive section, but also stated that it recognized the possibility of abuses in the sale of war materials. It concluded its report on this subject by stating that: 'The Committee feels that this matter should be the subject of investigation and determination by the Armed Services Committees." The Retired Officers Association intends to pursue the matter further along the above suggested lines and do its utmost to prevent further enactments of what it considers to be unjust and unnecessary discrimination.

PROPOSED REFUND—Continued from page 5

quired to serve in higher ranks with increased responsibility at the same pay they were formerly receiving, reduced by the general pay reductions imposed upon employees of the government in the interests of economy.

Sections 201 and 202 of the Economy Acts of 1932 and 1933 are quoted as follows:

> SEC. 201. All provisions of law which confer upon civilian or non-civilian officers or employees of the United States Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia automatic increases in compensation by reason of length of service or promotion are suspended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933; but this section shall not be construed to deprive any person of any increment of compensation received through an automatic increase in compensation prior to July 1, 1932
>
> SEC. 202. No administrative promotions in the civil branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia shall be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933; PROVIDED, That the filling of a vacancy, when authorized by the President, by the appointment of an employee of a lower grade, shall not be construed as an administrative promotion but no such appointment shall increase the compensation of such employee to a rate in excess of the minimum rate of the grade to which such employee is appointed, unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation. The President shall submit to Congress a report of the vacancies filled under this section up to November 1, 1932, on the first day of the next regular session. The provisions of this section shall not apply to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets, of the Coast Guard.

The impropriety and injustice of those provisions as applied to officers receiving pay under the terms of the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922 as a result of the interpretation of the Comptroller General was recognized by the Congress in the Act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 522, 523). This Act, in section 24, amended section 201 of the Economy Acts of 1932 and 1933 so as to terminate the suspension of pay increases to the officers of the armed services accruing through promotion, but retained the suspension of longevity increases which otherwise accrued to such officers. The amendment, however, did not restore the payment of back compensation for increases in pay by reason of promotion withheld for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1933, and June 30, 1934.

By this action the Congress at that time removed the injustice to this comparatively small number of military officers paid by the Government and placed them on the same basis with others for the future without providing for reimbursement of compensation lost which had nevertheless been enjoyed by others in the government service during

that period of time. Reimbursement for these inequitable losses should now be authorized.

This inequity was pointed out to the Congress by the then Secretaries of Navy and of War and by the Bureau of the Budget, all of whom in 1934, when the pertinent legislation was under consideration, invited attention to the provisions in the Economy Acts which prevented officers of the uniformed services, promoted to higher grades during the period of application of the laws, from receiving the pay and allowances of the grades to which promoted, while during the same periods others in government service promoted under similar conditions received the benefit of the additional compensation receivable as a result of promotions. The hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the Naval Appropriation Bill for the fiscal year 1935 brought out the effects of section 201 of the Economy Act and the resultant disparity between the pay and allowances of officers promoted within the respective services between 1 July 1932 and 30 June 1934 as well as the disparity in treatment resulting from the wording of the Economy Act under which enlisted men were entitled to increased pay while promotions of officers under the same provisions of law were not entitled to increases during the same period. This disparity in treatment and receipt of pay was pointed out during this same period in three decisions of the Comptroller General (13. Comp. Gen. Dec. 104; 12 Comp. Gen. Dec. 108; 12 Comp. Gen. Dec. 560).

The interpretation which was placed upon section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932 prohibited increases in pay which resulted from actual promotions in rank. Such interpretation and application was never intended by Congress. Section 202 of the same Act prohibited only "administrative promotions" but allowed increases in pay for promotions from a lower to a higher grade in the Civil Service. The same result was intended by Congress with reference to promotions in the military service. As before stated, Congress made clear its original intention by its action in amending section 201 through section 24 of the Act of March 28, 1934, but only prospectively.

The history of the original law and the reactions to it clearly point out that those receiving pay under military services pay acts suffered reductions in pay that were not imposed on others in Government service. The heads of the armed services almost immediately invited the attention of Congress to this fact.

In a letter to the Chairman of the Special Economy Committee, United States Senate, at the time the extension of the economy legislation to apply to fiscal year 1934 was under consideration, the then Secretary of the Navy expressed opposition to the provisions affecting the pay of officers. He called attention to the inequity and injustice of the provisions which prevented officers promoted to higher grades, during the life of the legislation, from receiving the pay and allowances of the grades to which promoted, in addition to barring their receipt of increase in pay due to longevity credits.

Under the date of December 13, 1932, the Secretary of War, in a letter addressed to the Chairman, Special Economy Committee, United States Senate, expressed the following view concerning the above measure:

> "In justice to this small group who are bearing such an unjust portion of the economy burden, the War Department appeal to Congress for the adjustment or elimination of Section 201 of the Economy Act."

The Bureau of the Budget early in 1934 also proposed a restoration of automatic increases in compensation of the personnel of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

Several decisions of the Comptroller General rendered in the years 1932 and 1933 served to point out the effect of the law as enacted, and raised the question of the intent of Congress with respect to the specific cases involved. (See 12 Comp. Gen. Dec. 560—Mar. 31, 1933; 12 Comp. Gen. Dec. 108—July 25, 1932; 13 Comp. Gen. Dec. 104—Oct. 13, 1933.)

Military officers were, by the effect of these laws, required to serve in higher ranks with increased responsibilities for varying periods of time up to two years at the rates of pay they were receiving at the time when they were promoted during the two-year period between June 30, 1932, and June 30, 1934. The effect of these inequitable losses was visited upon the group involved purely by chance, since those who received promotions on or prior to June 30, 1932, and on or after July 1, 1934, were not subjected to such losses.

That these inequitable losses were not intended will appear from a consideration of the legislation, its application to civilian employees of the government who received their increases in pay as the result of promotions during the same period, the subsequent action of the Congress in removing the unintended result in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1935, and the reports of the congressional committees on the latter legislation.

The interpretation by the Comptroller General of the phrase "automatic increases in compensation by reason of length of service or promotion" contained in section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932 barred increases in pay for actual promotions in rank. The language in question seems clearly to have been intended to apply only to longevity increases in pay, provided in the Pay Readjustment Act of June 10, 1922, which were "automatic" in nature. That the latter interpretation was not intended is borne out by the fact that Section 202 of the Economy Act of 1932 barred increases of pay of civilian servants of the Government only in cases of "administrative promotions" but specifically authorized increases of pay to such personnel when promoted from a lower to a higher rating.

As a result of having pointed out to it the unfair and apparently unintended effect of the unfortunate phrasing of section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in Report No. 227 on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1935, in recommending amendment of that section stated in part:

> "The committee feels that in continuing the general economy legislation for the fiscal year 1935 there should not be a total relaxation in the prohibition against automatic promotions and that **whatever is done continuing the prohibition in that respect should be based upon equal treatment to all persons** in all the automatic groups. The ban upon automatic promotions is, therefore, continued for the next fiscal year, modified in one respect to correct **an injustice resulting more from interpretation than from legislative intent**, the explanation of which appears hereinafter. (Emphasis supplied).
>
> "It has been brought to the attention of the committee that the **existing economy legislation denying automatic increases has been construed as applying to increases within the six 'commissioned' services upon advancement in rank.** That is, where an officer passes from a lower to a higher rank, he may have the rank but not the pay attached thereto, if the change normally would entail a higher rate of pay. Whether the advancement in rank in all cases means a change of duties or responsibilities or not, it is fair to assume that it does and **it is not believed that it was the intention of Congress to deny the pay the law provides for each rank under the conditions applicable in any given case.** (Emphasis supplied)
>
> "Advancement in rank, under the peculiar and complicated pay law applying to the several commissioned services does not always carry with it an increase of pay. The length of service factor enters into the question. **But where, under the law, considering such factor, increased rank carries increased pay, the committee believes that the spirit and intent of the law, if not the letter, should be complied with.** That accords with the general practice in the civil services where officers and employees of the Government who may, under existing and proposed economy laws, receive an increase in compensation when that increase is incidental to a promotion resulting from the filling of a vacancy from a lower to a higher position. (Emphasis supplied)
>
> "**Consequently, the section touching automatic promotions which it is proposed to reenact has been modified to insure that officers advanced in rank shall receive such increase, if any, as may be attached to the new rank, but limiting the computation of longevity pay to the number of increments earned as of June 30, 1932.** Longevity pay falls in the class of automatic increases and the amendment does not propose to disturb the suspension of increase normally flowing from length of service. (Emphasis supplied)
>
> "The provision dealing with automatic promotions, if reenacted as amended, **will remove existing inequalities, will avoid discrimination, and will place, as near as possible, all officers and employees of the Government—military, quasi-military, and civil—upon an equal footing so far as prohibition of automatic increases in compensation is concerned during the fiscal 1935.**" (Emphasis supplied)

The Senate Committee on Appropriations in its Report

No. 294 (Feb. 6, 1934) on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1935, began its report as follows:

> **"The bill as it came from the House provided that section 201 of the original economy act, as continued, which prohibited all automatic increases in compensation, should not prevent increases in compensation by reason of advancement in rank under the Joint Pay Act of June 10, 1922. The committee has amended this provision to provide that section 201 shall apply during the fiscal year 1935 only to the extent that it suspends the longevity increases for the services mentioned in the Pay Adjustment Act, that is, the 5-percent increase over the base pay for each 3 years of service. The effect of the committee provision is to restore on July 1, 1934, all automatic promotion privileges except in the one instance noted."** (Emphasis supplied)

Our Association has been furnished a copy of the report on this bill to the Committee on the Judiciary which was made by the Navy Department on behalf of the Department of Defense. That report points out the unjust discrimination which has been described in our statement, but in view of the breadth of the pending bill, the Department of Defense recommends against its enactment. It is felt that, had the bill been drawn so as merely to remove the discrimination against the relatively small group who were promoted in rank during the fiscal years 1933 and 1934, the Department of Defense might well have approved its enactment on the basis that, in justice, a discrimination of this character should be corrected wherever and whenever it is found to exist.

It is true that a long time has elapsed since the unintended losses of pay were suffered by a comparatively small group of commissioned officers of the uniformed services. Nevertheless, whenever the fact of injustice is established, such injustice should be remedied. The record clearly shows that this group did not receive the pay increases that were not denied the others; the remedy is simple, and of relatively little cost, to do simple justice to loyal servants of the government.

In my letter of 13 December 1949 to the Honorable Pat McCarran, Chairman of this Committee, it was pointed out that the bill S. 1119 as written goes beyond the principles already discussed of reimbursement for inequitable losses suffered. The bill as written would restore *all* losses suffered by military personnel during the period in question as the result of the economy laws and if that were now done military personnel would be thus singled out for more favorable treatment than civilian employees. All should contribute alike to the economies which were then imposed upon government employees by Congress and it is for that very reason that appropriate legislation should now be enacted to restore the inequitable losses to the group which suffered them as has been explained in this statement.

In order to limit the reimbursement to those sums and in conformity with the principles of equity heretofore set forth, the bill should be amended in the following manner:

> In line 8 of page 2 of the bill, after the word "period" insert the following: "(excluding the longevity increases provided for in the tenth paragraph of said Act of June 10, 1922)".

The Sub-committee ordered this bill reported favorably to the full Judiciary Committee at an executive session on 18 July 1950. The Senate Judiciary Committee, however, decided it did not have jurisdiction over the subject of this proposal; that it appeared to be a matter which should more properly be considered by the Armed Services Committee. Consequently, that Committee recommended to the Senate that the bill be re-referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee. That was done on 21 July 1950, where the measure is now under consideration.

In view of the fact that the hearings which were held by the Sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee appear to be thorough and complete, and therefore provide adequate information concerning the merits of this proposed legislation, it is to be hoped that the Senate Armed Services Committee will find justification for recommending its enactment without the necessity for further hearings, whether in the present session or the next Congress.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has been so fully occupied with defense legislation, that now with a recess or adjournment imminent, it appears unlikely that this bill will receive further consideration during this Congress. It is to be hoped that the legislative and world situation will be such next year that early action will be in order during the 82d Congress.

IMPLEMENTATION—Continued from page 5

standing of the manner in which the income tax authorities will apply the law. That information indicated delay in exercising their options will, in many cases, result in savings to the individuals concerned. It therefore behooves those who might be affected to understand their opportunities before exercising their elections. One may delay exercising his election until 30 September 1954 (5 years after the effective date of the Act).

PAY FOR HIGHEST RANK—The new pay law now provides that those previously retired, who for reasons of length of service or degree of disability are entitled to increases in pay under it, are entitled to have their retired pay computed on the basis of the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily at any time.

Under the prior pay laws those who served in World War II were entitled to compute their retired pay on the basis of the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily during World War II. That was provided in Public Law 305 (79th Congress) for the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard; in Public Law 810 (80th Congress) for the Army and Air Force; and in appropriate legislation relating to other components of the uniformed services.

It has long been the desire of all familiar with the situation to extend comparable benefits to others who served equally meritoriously in higher ranks prior to World War II. That is adequately supported by the reaction to our recommendations in this regard when Admiral Hamlet testified on H.R. 2553, the bill which became the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Congress). The testimony was as follows:

> **"Admiral Hamlet.** Public Law 305, 79th Congress, granted to those in the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard the pay of the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily during World War II, and Public Law 810, 80th Congress, granted similar benefits to those who served in the Army and Air Force. When legislation which became Public Law 810 was before the Congress in H.R. 2744, 80th Congress, it was strongly recommended that its provisions in this respect be extended to those who served in World War I. Those who served in World War I were retired in the highest ranks in which they served satisfactorily but without the retired pay, their retired pay being now based upon their permanent ranks. While it was conceded and recognized by all that the services performed by those who served in World War I were just as important and just as meritorious, relatively, as the services of those who served in World War II, Public Law 810 did not include provision for those who served in World War I, since it was felt that separate legislation should be considered for the latter purpose.
>
> "In view of the above, legislation should be enacted to compute the retired pay of those who served in World War I on the basis of the highest ranks in which they served satisfactorily, and it is urged such a provision be included in any pay legislation which may now be enacted.
>
> **"Mr. Kilday.** On that subject I might say, Admiral, in the last Congress and this I have had a bill pending for that legislation, and we now have a favorable report. I think you can be assured that that will receive the attention of the committee.
>
> **"Admiral Hamlet.** I am glad to get that assurance.
>
> **"Mr. Short.** I think it is high time we stop discriminating between soldiers in different wars."

It is clear that justice requires an amendment to the new pay law to permit those who, because of the misfortune of early retirement for one reason or another, are not entitled to an increase in retired pay under the new law, to compute their pay on the basis of the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily, based upon the pay rates which existed under the former pay law. Our Association has made such a recommendation to Rep. Kilday, Chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee having jurisdiction over pay matters. We believe this could be done by adding a proviso to Section 519 of the new Act, as follows: *"Provided,* That, effective from 1 October 1949, such members, former members or persons shall be entitled to

receive that retired or retirement pay which they would be entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day preceding date of enactment of this Act, based on the highest federally recognized rank, grade or rating satisfactorily held by such members, former members or persons, whether under a permanent or temporary appointment, for any period of service."

Our Association has been informed by Rep. Kilday that, in view of certain deficiencies in and interpretations of the new pay law, the Committee is assembling data for the purpose of consolidating all meritorious proposals into a single amendment. It does not appear likely that such an amendment will be introduced in the present Congress, but it will be introduced early in the next Congress.

Another matter of importance which will come up for consideration in that omnibus proposal is that which relates to the length of service which it is necessary to have performed in order to be entitled to compute pay on the basis of a higher temporary rank in which service has been performed satisfactorily. It will be recalled that under Public Law 810 —80th Congress, a six months service provision was included to establish entitlement to receive retired pay based upon a particular rank. Congress eliminated that provision, as a requirement, in the new pay Act. Nevertheless, in the implementation of the new Act, the six months requirement is being preserved administratively, despite what appears to have been the clear intention of the Congress to the contrary. No doubt there will be new legislative consideration of that important question.

CREDITING OF SERVICE WHICH HAS BEEN OVERLOOKED—The new pay law has credited service of almost every description. It has, by appropriate saving clauses, preserved the crediting of service to which there was entitlement under former laws. In the above respects, however, some service has been overlooked and there are pending proposals to extend credit to them. One such proposal is the bill introduced by Rep. Anderson of California (H.R. 7882), to extend credit to certain Army hedquarters clerks or Quartermaster clerks whose service, although performed in a civilian capacity, was precisely the same in character as that performed in other branches of the Army as Army field clerks in military status.

Another is the important and just proposal to credit service as cadet, midshipman, aviation cadet and flying cadet, included in S. 631 introduced by Sen. Tydings, and H.R. 7246 introduced by Rep. Vinson, elsewhere reported in this issue. In connection with the crediting of service at our service academies, an interesting situation has developed through the implementation of the new pay Act which adds greatly to the justice for the proposed crediting of such service. Service as cadets and midshipmen has in the past been credited for all purposes to those who served in classes to and including the class of 1916 at the service academies. It appears clearly to have been intended, by appropriate saving clauses, to preserve that and all other rights with regard to the crediting of service in the new pay law. Insofar as academy service is concerned, Section 202 (a)(6) of the Act preserves such and other service to the extent that computation of basic pay is concerned. Unfortunately, however, it appears clear that credit for such service was not saved for the purpose of establishing the multiple applied to basic pay to establish retired pay, as provided in Sections 411 and 511 of the new law. In reaching this conclusion it is necessary for one to read Section 102 (b) of the Act in connection with Sections 411 and 511. As a result of this interpretation the Navy Department has withheld credit for that service to those who were formerly able to use it, resulting in individuals losing up to 6 years service (including 2 years service as Passed Midshipman in some cases) in the establishment of their multiple, awaiting a Comptroller General's decision on the subject which the Navy Department has requested. Should that decision support what clearly appears to be the effect of the new law in this respect, the credit for the service involved should be restored by the enactment of legislation crediting such service to all others who have performed it at any time.

BACK PAY BENEFITS TO SURVIVORS—Under the new law no specific provision is made for the exercise of an option by the widow or next of kin of a retired officer who has died prior to making his election. However, in opinion B-96250 of 28 July 1950, the Comptroller General has held that there appears to be no sound reason for refusing to permit the legal representative of the estate of a deceased retired officer to make the so-called "election." The Comptroller General's ruling on this subject is as follows:

"The next question presented is whether or not representatives of the estates of incompetent or deceased retired persons can at this time exercise the right of election provided in section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, **supra.** It is assumed you refer to legal representatives of such estates and what is hereinafter stated with respect to this question is based on that assumption.

"Section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relates generally to persons theretofore retired for physical disability who are receiving or entitled to receive retirement pay, and persons theretofore granted or entitled to receive retirement pay for physical disability. Such persons are granted the right to elect to qualify for disability retirement pay under the provisions of that act or to receive retirement pay computed under one of the two methods contained in section 511 of the act. If they elect to qualify for disability retirement pay under the act, it is provided that the percentage of their disability is to be based on their disability as of the time they were last retired or as of the time they were last granted retirement pay, as the case may be.

"The general rule appears to be that the right to make an election is a personal right and, in the absence of express statutory authority, a legal representative of an estate may not exercise such election without the consent of the court having jurisdiction over such estate. See 25 Am. Jur., Guardian and Ward, section 104. However, while the statutory provision here in question uses the word 'elect,' it, in effect, actually is more in the nature of a savings provision, the purpose of which is to give to the individuals covered thereby the benefit of those provisions of law under which they would draw the highest retired pay. Compare decision of April 13, 1950, answer to question (e), 29 Comp. Gen. 404, 407 (B-90755). Hence, it is not so much a matter of making an election as it is of computing an individual's retired pay under the various provisions of law in order to determine under which one he will receive the greatest retired pay. Thus viewed, there would appear to be no sound reason for refusing to permit the legal representative of the estate to make the so-called 'election.' Accordingly, this question is answered in the affirmative."

Information has been received by our Association that the department concerned will notify the widow or next of kin of the individual whose pay status is involved in the same manner as if the officer were alive as to the degree of disability and rates of pay under the options provided. This notification should be forthcoming in the near future, since the information is essential to those who are to make the necessary elections. If such information is not received within a reasonable time, it would behoove those interested to write the department concerned for the necessary information. It appears from the opinion that the election must be made by the executor or administrator of the estate in each case, which will require the individual who wishes to make the election on behalf of the deceased, to obtain letters of administration, in order to have authority to do so.

SCHOLARSHIPS AT PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY, EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Over $125,000 has been awarded for the academic year 1950-51 by the Faculty of Phillips Exeter Academy for use in providing scholarships to outstanding boys of 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade age who, because of limited resources, would otherwise be unable to benefit from the fine preparatory training which obtains at a school of that high academic standing.

Those scholarships are based strictly upon a boy's own merit. Standards which must be met, include: (1) Need; (2) Scholastic Ability; and (3) Character.

Boys admitted, who remain in good standing, both in scholarship and aptitude continue eligible to receive financial support of the Academy from time of entrance to graduation. Moreover, such boys are assisted, as possible, in their efforts to secure college scholarships.

Phillips Exeter Academy, located in Rockingham County, New Hampshire, fifty-one miles from Boston, was formally opened in 1783, and has since been foremost in schools of its type. Its curriculum comprises all basic subjects required for college entrance, proper moral and religious environment, and a program of physical development through supervised sports.

Anyone interested in seeking further information on this subject should write to—

Mr. Hamilton Bissell
Director of Scholarship Boys
Phillips Exeter Academy
Exeter, New Hampshire

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF 31 JULY 1950

Cash in Bank (Hamilton National Bank), 31 July 1950	5,220.41
Petty Cash on Hand	25.00
Total Available Cash	5,245.41
U. S. GOVERNMENT BONDS	39,800.00
Accrued interest on 23 "F" Series Bonds	85.00
Total Available Fiscal Assets	$45,130.41
Book Value of Office Equipment	8,008.65
Worth as of 31 July 1950	$53,139.06

MEMBERSHIP BREAKDOWN AS OF 31 JULY 1950

Army	8,997
Navy	5,948
Air Force	1,882
Marine Corps	771
Coast Guard	1,121
Coast & Geodetic Survey	45
Public Health Service	50
Total	18,814
Life Members (Non-dues-paying status)	1,008
Life Members (Dues-paying-status)	1,101
Members	16,705
Total	18,814

OBITUARIES

We pause in deep reverence and honor to the memory of the following of our members for whom taps have been sounded since 1 May, last. May their brave souls forever rest in peace—

Ens. L. M. Adams, NC, USN, Ret.
Capt. J. R. Allen, USN, Ret.
1stLt. A. Anderson, USAF, Ret.
Capt. G. L. Angeny, MC, USN, Ret.
LtComdr. C. B. Archer, SC, USN, Ret.
Col. G. S. Armes, USA, Ret.
RAdm. J. R. Armstrong, USN, Ret.
Capt. W. H. Barrow, USA, Ret.
RAdm. O. R. Bennehoff, USN, Ret.
Capt. E. Berg, USA, Ret.
Maj. D. W. Blake, USMC, Ret.
Maj. O. Burkard, USA, Ret.
Brig.Gen. E. L. Butts, USA, Ret.
Comdr. R. S. Carr, USN, Ret.
LtComdr. H. H. Chenoweth, USNR, Ret.
VAdm. H. H. Christy, USN, Ret.
Maj. J. O. Cote, USMC, Ret.
ChBosn. F. J. Davis, USN, Ret.
Lt. L. W. Drisco, USN, Ret.
Maj. E. Dworvak, USA, Ret.
LtCol. H. W. Edmonds, USA, Ret.
Comdr. E. C. Edwards, SC, USN, Ret.
BrigGen. C. L. Fike, USMC, Ret.
Lt. P. H. Foley, USN, Ret.
Mach. L. W. Forsythe, USCG, Ret.
Lt(jg). G. O. Frederick, USN, Ret.
ChMach. W. P. Gaynor, USN, Ret.
Bosn. C. F. Garrison, USCG, Ret.
LtCol. W. J. Gilbert, USA, Ret.
Maj. J. R. Goodale, USA, Ret.
Maj. P. Grossman, AFUS, Ret.
Maj. H. Hart, USA, Ret.
LtCol. C. J. Hawley, USA, Ret.
Capt. S. L. Hebert, MC, AUS, Ret.
Comdr. G. C. Hern, USN, Ret.
Maj. S. S. Ingalls, MC, AUS, Ret.
LtCol. L. B. Jacobs, USA, Ret.
Maj. E. A. Jonas, USMC, Ret.
Lt. F. Keil, USN, Ret.
Capt. A. O. Kenyon, ChC, AUS, Ret.
LtComdr. F. G. King, USNR, Ret.
LtComdr. B. Knight, USN, Ret.
LtCol. A. H. Lang, AUS, Ret.
ChBosn. C. A. Lawrence, USN, Ret.
LtCol. S. C. Leasure, USA, Ret.
BrigGen. L. A. Ledbetter, USA, Ret.
Lt. F. J. Leonard, USN, Ret.
Col. A. J. Lynch, USA, Ret.
LtComdr. G. S. Magnusson, USCGR, Ret.
1stLt. W. N. Marlin, Jr., AFUS, Ret.
Capt. A. Martin, MC, USA, Ret.
BrigGen. L. B. McAfee, USA, Ret.
1stLt. W. F. McCahren, AUS, Ret.
Col. A. V. McDermott, AUS, Ret.
LtComdr. J. Moran, USN, Ret.
Lt. A. O. Mundale, USN, Ret.
Maj. J. A. Myers, AUS, Ret.
Maj. B. J. Nasief, AFUS, Ret.
Capt. E. F. Ney, SC, USN, Ret.
BrigGen. W. R. Nichols, USA, Ret.
Comdr. F. W. Osborn, USN, Ret.
LtComdr. H. E. Padley, USN, Ret.
Comdr. H. C. Pavian, USNR, Ret.
Capt. E. J. Place, USA, Ret.
Col. J. W. Reed, AUS, Ret.
Comdr. J. C. Riffe, MC, USNR, Ret.
LtCol. C. S. Schmidt, USMC, Ret.
Col. F. Schmitter, USA, Ret.
ChElec. K. J. Shambeau, USCG, Ret.
LtComdr. E. J. Smith, SC, USN, Ret.
Maj. J. E. Spence, AFUS, Ret.
Comdr. E. W. Spencer, USN, Ret.
Maj. W. A. Stack, USA, Ret.
Col. J. N. Straat, USA, Ret.
1stLt. W. Stratton, USA, Ret.
Maj. H. T. Swain, USMC, Ret.
Maj. R. B. Swiger, AFUS, Ret.
LtComdr. J. L. Thibault, USN, Ret.
MajGen. C. A. Trott, USA, Ret.
Capt. H. L. Walruff, USA, Ret.
LtCol. J. R. Walsh, AUS, Ret.
Capt. J. E. Walters, AUS, Ret.
Col. J. M. White, USA, Ret.
BrigGen. F. Whitehead, USMC, Ret.

To RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
1616 Eye St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Date _____

Gentlemen:—

You may enroll me as a member of the Retired Officers Association. Inclosed is check for $5.00.

Entrance fee	$1.00	*Fifty cents of which is for subscription to Association Bulletin.*
Annual dues	4.00	
	$5.00	

Name _____
(Please Print)

Rank and Service _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS

Capt. E. O. P., ChC, AUS, Ret.—May I take advantage of this opportunity to thank you for your tireless efforts in the interests of service personnel. The feeling of security that the Association offers to retired officers has no price other than gratefulness.

Lieut. (W) L. C., USNR, Ret.—I can not write without telling you how much I have enjoyed the Bulletin and how much I have appreciated the many courtesies you have extended to me.

Maj. E. C. W., AFUS, Ret.—Your quarterly Bulletins are certainly fine. I really appreciate the information you send out. Enclosed is a list of friends with whom I correspond. If they are not members, am sure they would like to belong.

W.O. V. T. B., USMC, Ret.—The Bulletin is concise and informative. My thanks for the valuable work the Association is doing.

1st Lieut. S. F. T., ANC, Ret.—I look forward to the arrival of the Bulletin and have passed it along to a few of my friends to read. They, too, have expressed pleasure with it and plan to join the Association. Please keep up the good work.

RAdm. W. C. W., USN, Ret.—In acknowledgement of your kind letter, I wish to express great appreciation for the trouble you took in answering so fully and clearly the several inquiries which I submitted. That information is most helpful to me.

Col. A. S. B., Jr., USA, Ret.—Words fail to express my appreciation for the very efficient and human manner in obtaining the desired information from the Adjutant General. The Association with my case is an example of where we may appeal for prompt assistance in making direct contact with appropriate headquarters. Again, to know that there is an Association of Retired Officers looking after our affairs, leaves one with an immense feeling of security and comfort.

The wife of a retired officer writes—This is to thank you for your kind and painstaking answers to the questions contained in my previous letter. I should have been quite at a loss to know how to get the information desired if I were not an avid reader of the Bulletin. This interest was aroused because my husband is too ill to read and has been for five years. However, he is still keenly interested in service matters.

NOTES TO MEMBERS

Regularly scheduled publication of the Bulletin is as follows: 1st Quarter, 15 December; 2nd Quarter, 15 March; 3rd Quarter, 15 June; 4th Quarter, 15 September.

A most hearty welcome is extended to those who have become members during the past several months. Suggestions from members as to the manner in which our Bulletin might be improved will be welcomed.

Members are urged to keep National Headquarters informed of any change in the mailing address. In reporting such changes, it would be helpful if old and new addresses were given.

Upon invitation by the Attorney General of the United States, for representation of the Association at the Fifth National Conference on Citizenship, held at the Statler Hotel in Washington, 22-24 May 1950, the following were named delegates and participated: Admiral Hamlet, Captain Willenbucher, and Lt-Comdr. Bailey.

Those desiring attractive lapel rosettes, indicating membership in our Association, may obtain same from National Headquarters at the nominal charge of 50c each.

It occurs to us that some of our members might be interested in joining the Military Order of the World Wars. Many already belong to both organizations.

That Order, composed of commissioned officers who served in either World War, is highly patriotic, devoted primarily to cherish the memories and associations of the World Wars waged for humanity. It serves to foster fraternal relations between all branches of the Armed Forces and to promote love of Country and Flag.

Anyone interested in receiving information concerning eligibility requirements or other particulars, should communicate with its National Headquarters, 1700 Eye Street N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

> I believe in my country. I believe in it because it is made up of my fellowmen—and myself. I can't go back on either of us and be true to my creed. If it isn't the best country in the world, it is partly because I am not the kind of a man that I should be. —Charles Stelzle

RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

1616 Eye Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Entered as second class matter, May 2, 1945, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879.